(b) if so, what are the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (DR. RAJA RAMANNA): (a) and (b) After August 1989, there have been no talks between India and Pakistan on redeployment of troops.

**Committee on Haffkine Institute for Training, Research and Testing**

852. DR. BAPU KALDATE: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government had appointed a committee to develop the Haffkine Institute for Training, Research and Testing and the Haffkine Bio-Pharmaceutical Corporation Limited if so, when;

(b) whether the Committee had submitted its report;

(c) if so, what are the details of the recommendations made therein; and

(d) what are the details of the recommendations accepted by Government?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY WITH ADDITIONAL CHARGE OF THE MINISTER OF STATE IN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION IN THE MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (PROF. M. G. K. MENON):

(a) Yes Sir, an Expert Committee was constituted in May 3, 1988 for an in-depth study and review of the present capability, capacity etc. and to recommend a detailed plan for revival, technological upgradation and modernisation of the Haffkine Institute for Training and Research and Testing (HITRT) and Haffkine Bio-Pharmaceutical Corporation limited (HBPCL).

(b) Yes Sir, the Committee had submitted a summary Report.

(c) The main recommendations of the Committee are:—

—Continuing operations of these two gets in their present location in Parel is highly prejudicial to both, given that Parel is the heart of Bombay city which cannot accommodate all the modern infrastructure that would be required to produce biologicals conforming to stringent quality standards. Therefore, the Committee proposed two alternatives:

—ALTERNATIVE-I: move HITRT to a new location having HBPCL to continue in Parel but with major renovation of all buildings and additional facilities;

—ALTERNATIVE-II: move HBPCL to a new location (locations) leaving HITRT in Parel so that HITRT can continue in Parel and can renovate and supplement its buildings and augment its facilities. The Committee has also recommended that from all points of view Alternative-II is to be greately preferred.

—Some other important recommendations of the Committee are:—

—Existing facilities should be thoroughly renovated and expended to undertake manufacture of modern vaccines, sera and anti toxins as well as blood products, immunodiagnostics, intravenous injections etc.

—Manpower management, especially utilisation of surplus manpower presently available should be carefully planned with the help of manpower redeployment scheme of the Govt. of Maharashtra.

—The reorganisation would require enhanced levels of funding. Transfer of some assets from

HITRT to HBPCL should be affected. The equity share capital of the HBPCL may be increased and financial institutions may be approached for further capital and loans.

—Continuity of the senior management personnel should be ensured and proper manpower management should be developed.

—HBPCL would require special assistance in acquiring suitable competitive technology. In this, assistance of the Central Government will be of great value.

—The Central Government may also assist the HBPCL through off-take of vaccines and injectables at least for an initial period of five years.

—These institutons should attract high scientific leadership and outstanding research scientists.

—HITRT may be given adequate autonomy on the pattern of National Institute of Immunology.

—Strong support of the Maharashtra Govt. in this national effort to re-establish HITRT as a centre of excellence is essential.

(d) Since HITRT and HBPCL are institutions of the Government of Maharashtra, the Summary Report of the Expert Committee has been sent to the State Government for further consideration and action. The Government of India will continue to be in touch with the State Govt. concerning the follow-up.

**दिल्ली समाज कल्याण सलाहकार बोर्ड के कल्याण अधिकारी के विरुद्ध शिकायतें**

853. **श्री पुनोल कुमार पट्टनायक :** क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) पिछले एक वर्ष के दौरान दिल्ली समाज कल्याण सलाहकार बोर्ड के कल्याण अधिकारी के विरुद्ध विभिन्न संस्थाओं से कुल कितनी शिकायतें प्राप्त हुई हैं ;

(ख) उनका ब्यौरा क्या है ; और

(ग) क्या यह सच है कि उच्च अधिकारियों की सांठगांठ से उन शिकायतों को रद्द कर दिया गया है ?

**विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री साथ में मानव संसाधन विकास मंत्रालय में शिक्षा विभाग में राज्य मंत्री का अतिरिक्त प्रभार (प्रो० एम० जी० के० मेनन) :** (क) और (ख) एक विवरणसंलग्न है । (नीचे देखिये

(ग) जी, नहीं । इन शिकायतों की या तो जांच की जा चुकी है अथवा इनकी छानबीन जारी है ।

**विवरण**

(क) पिछले एक वर्ष के दौरान केन्द्रीय समाज कल्याण बोर्ड को 4 संस्थाओं से दिल्ली समाज कल्याण सलाहकार बोर्ड के कल्याण अधिकारी के खिलाफ शिकायतें मिली हैं ।

(ख) शिकायत के ब्यौरे, संस्था के नाम सहित नीचे दिए गए अनुसार हैं :—

1. अखिल भारतीय भ्रष्टाचार-विरोधी और कल्याण समिति

शिकायत समिति के प्रधान द्वारा की गई है और उसका सार इस प्रकार है:—

(1) श्री चोपड़ा कार्यालय आने में अनियमित रहते हैं (2) बुरा व्यवहार और घूस लेना (3) कार्यालय के वाहनों का दुरुपयोग ।